DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 304 188 JC 890 110

AUTHOR Tichenor, Richard
TITLE Fall 1987 Nonreturning Student Survey Findings.
INSTITUTION Saint Louis Community Coll., MO. Office of Institutional Research and Planning.
PUB DATE 2 Nov 88
NOTE 24p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Academic Persistence; Community Colleges; Dropout Attitudes; Dropout Research; *Dropouts; *Enrollment Influences; Participant Satisfaction; School Holding Power; *Stopouts; *Student Attitudes; *Student Educational Objectives; Two Year Colleges; *Withdrawal (Education)

ABSTRACT

In spring 1988, a survey was conducted of students who attended St. Louis Community College (SLCC) in fall 1987, did not graduate, and did not return for the spring semester. A questionnaire was mailed to 20% (N=2,270) of the fall 1987 non-returning students, requesting information on educational goals, attainment of or progress toward these goals, attendance history, educational plans, reasons for not re-enrolling, and personal characteristics. Study findings, based on responses from 439 former students, included the following: (1) 27% of the respondents indicated that they had accomplished their educational goal (i.e., were goal achievers), 63% planned to attend SLCC at a future date (i.e., were stop-outs), and 10% had not attained their goal and had no plans to return to SLCC (i.e., were dropouts); (2) 49% of the goal achievers indicated that their goal had been to prepare for transfer, 38% were attending for personal interest, and 37% were attending to improve their job skills; (3) 46% of the stop-outs and 29% of the dropouts cited "other demands on time too great to take courses" as one of their major reasons for interrupting or terminating their studies; and (4) 88% of the respondents rated SLCC "good" or "excellent" as a school for students with educational goals similar to their own. Appendixes present the survey instrument and background information on student outcomes and retention. (AJL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED304188

TM 89 - #7

FALL 1987 NONRETURNING
STUDENT SURVEY
FINDINGS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Tichenor

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

November 2, 1988

Prepared by:

Richard Tichenor
Management Information Analyst

All Inquiries Regarding This Document
Should Be Made To:

Office of Institutional Research and Planning
St. Louis Community College
5801 Wilson Avenue
St. Louis, MO 63110

JC 890 110

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents findings from the second biennial survey of nonreturning students. The term "nonreturning students" is used here to refer to students who attended St. Louis Community College in a fall semester, did not graduate, and did not return for the spring semester. The students included in the second biennial survey were Fall 1987 students who did not graduate, nor return for the Spring 1988 semester.

GOAL ACHIEVERS, STOP-OUTS, AND DROP-OUTS

Two of the more fundamental questions on the nonreturning student survey ask whether the student had achieved his or her educational goal as of the end of the Fall semester, and whether the student plans to re-enroll at St. Louis Community College. On the basis of this information, the respondents can be categorized as "goal achievers", "stop-outs", or "drop-outs". The percentage of respondents in each category were as follows:

GOAL ACHIEVERS	27%
STOP-OUTS	63%
DROP-OUTS	10%

Chapter II presents the corresponding findings for individual educational goal subsets, and by individual campus.

REASONS FOR STOPPING-OUT AND DROPPING-OUT

Those nonreturners who had not completed their educational goal, i.e. stop-outs and drop-outs, were asked to respond to a question regarding their reasons for interrupting or discontinuing attendance at St. Louis Community College. The question listed sixteen potential reasons and space for respondents to specify additional reasons. It asked that stop-outs and drop-outs respond to each item in the list by indicating whether it was a "A Major Reason", "A Minor Reason", or "Not A Reason".

The five reasons most often cited as "A Major Reason" for stopping-out, and the percentage of stop-outs indicating each as "A Major Reason" were as follows:

1.	Other Demands On Time Too Great To Take Courses	46%
2.	Demands Of Job Too Great To Take Courses	31%
3.	Needed To Work More Hours To Meet Financial Commitments	24%
4.	Can Not Take Courses At The Times They Are Offered	22%
5.	Could Not Afford Fees, Books, Etc.	15%

The five reasons most often cited as "A Major Reason" for dropping-out, and the percentage of drop-outs indicating each as "A Major Reason" were:

1.	Other Demands On Time Too Great To Take Courses	29%
2.	Demands Of Job Too Great To Take Courses	22%
3.	Dissatisfied With Counseling And Advising Services	17%
4.	Dissatisfied With Quality Of Instruction	15%
5.	Moved, SLCC Not Convenient From New Home	15%

Chapter III presents the findings for the full list of reasons at both the District and campus level of analysis.

RATINGS OF ST. LOUIS COMMUNITY COLLEGE

All respondents were asked to rate St. Louis Community College "... as an educational institution for students with your educational goal" on the following scale: "Poor", "Fair", "Good" or "Excellent". The percentages of respondents awarding each rating were as follows:

EXCELLENT	33%
GOOD	55%
FAIR	10%
POOR	1%

Chapter IV presents the ratings by educational goal subset, by type of nonreturner (goal achievers, stop-outs, and drop-outs), and for the campus as well as District level of analysis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY		i-ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS		iii
CHAPTER I:	INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER II:	GOAL ACHIEVERS, STOP-OUTS, AND DROP-OUTS	2-4
CHAPTER III:	REASONS FOR STOPPING-OUT AND DROPPING-OUT	5-9
CHAPTER IV:	RATINGS OF ST. LOUIS COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENTS	10-12
APPENDIX I:	STUDENT OUTCOMES AND RETENTION	13-15
APPENDIX II:	QUESTIONNAIRE	16-19

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This report presents findings from the second biennial survey of nonreturning students. The term "nonreturning students" is used here to refer to students who attended St. Louis Community College in a fall semester, did not graduate, and did not return for the spring semester. The students included in the second biennial survey were Fall 1987 students who did not graduate, nor return for the Spring 1988 semester. The survey was mailed to 20% of the Fall 1987 nonreturners, a total of 2,270 former students.

The 20% sample was selected by a computer program which first sorted the nonreturning student records by educational goal and campus, and then produced mailing labels for every fifth student. (Students with a "Pre-Entry" educational goal were excluded from the sample due to the small number of students in that goal category.) The first mailing of the survey and accompanying cover letter on July 8, 1988 produced a 10% response rate, a second mailing on July 28, 1988 brought the number of usable surveys up to 439, a response rate of approximately 19%. Approximately 4% of the surveys were returned by the post office as undeliverable, due primarily to addressee moves.

Response rates within each educational goal category were as follows: AAS 20%; AA 16%: Certificate 22%; General Transfer 20%; Career Training 17%; Improve Job Skills 23%; Personal Interest 19%. Response rates for the individual campuses were 19% for Forest Park, 17% for Florissant Valley, and 19% for Meramec. (Six percent of the respondents did not provide campus identifying information, and are thus not included in campus level analyses and response rate computations.)

The topics covered by this report are: (1) the relative prevalent of goal achievers, stop-outs, and drop-outs; (2) reasons for stopping-out and dropping-out, and (3) opinions about St. Louis Community College. Chapter II presents the survey findings with respect to the percentage of respondents having achieved their educational goal, the percentage stopping-out, and the percentage dropping-out. Findings regarding the importance of various reasons for stopping-out and dropping-out are presented in Chapter III. Respondents' ratings of St. Louis Community College, and their suggestions as to how SLCC might better serve its students are discussed in Chapter IV.

Findings from Chapter II are used in a more extensive model of student outcomes and retention in Appendix I. A copy of the survey is included as Appendix II.

CHAPTER II

GOAL ACHIEVERS, STOP-OUTS, AND DROP-OUTS

Two of the more fundamental questions on the nonreturning student survey ask whether the student had achieved his or her educational goal as of the end of the Fall semester, and whether the student plans to re-enroll at St. Louis Community College. On the basis of this information, the respondents can be categorized as "goal achievers", "stop-outs", or "drop-outs". The percentage of respondents in each category can than be taken as an estimate of the corresponding percentages for the Fall 1987 nonreturning student population from which the survey sample was drawn. The respondent percentages for the District as a whole are presented in the table below.

The "Goal Achievers" column of the table refers to respondents who indicated they had achieved their non-degree goal; the "Stop-Out" column refers to respondents who indicated they had not yet achieved their goal, but planned to re-enroll at SLCC; and the "Drop-Out" column refers to respondents who indicated they had not achieved their goal, and did not plan to re-enroll at SLCC. The findings are presented for all respondents, and for respondents within each educational goal subset in terms of percentages rounded to the nearest whole percent. The three categories do not sum to 100% in some cases due to this rounding.

GOAL ACHIEVERS, STOP-OUTS, AND DROP-OUTS
AS PERCENTAGES OF ALL SURVEY RESPONDENTS AND
RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH EDUCATIONAL GOAL CATEGORY

	GOAL ACHIEVERS	STOP-OUTS	DROP-OUTS
ALL RESPONDENTS	27%	63%	10%
AAS	2%	88%	10%
AA	17%	76%	7%
CERTIFICATE	4%	96%	
GENERAL TRANSFER	49%	39%	13%
IMPROVE JOB SKILLS	37%	54%	9%
CAREER TRAINING	23%	63%	14%
PERSONAL INTEREST	38%	48%	15%

As can be seen in the table, almost two-thirds of the respondents were stop-outs, a little over one-fourth were goal achievers, and one-tenth were drop-outs. While the percentages vary notably between goals, stop-outs were also the most common type of nonreturner in all individual goal categories, except General Transfer, and goal achievers exceeded drop-outs in all non-degree goal categories.

Goal achievement was the highest among respondents with a General Transfer educational goal with almost one-half of those respondents indicating they had achieved their goal. Certificate respondents had the highest percentage of stop-outs, while the drop-out percentage was the greatest for Personal Interest respondents. It should be noted, however, that Personal Interest respondents also had the second highest goal achievement percentage.

Notable percentages of respondents who had begun the semester with a degree goal indicated they would not be re-enrolling because they had achieved a revised non-degree goal. In most instances, the goal achieved was General Transfer. This was especially prevalent among respondents who had begun the semester with an AA goal.

This finding suggests that once AA students have completed the specific courses which they plan to transfer to a four-year college, many may decide that they have actually achieved their primary goal. A similar rationale may lead some occupational degree students to leave without completing a degree, if they feel they have acquired their desired occupational skills or training prior to completion of the formal degree requirements.

One apparent anomaly in the findings is the lack of drop-outs among respondents with a Certificate educational goal. This is probably due to the very small size of the Certificate subset. In lieu of other evidence, this finding is probably best interpreted as simply indicating that the drop-out percentage for Certificate students was quite low.

Tables on the following page present the findings at the campus level of analysis. It should be noted, however, that disaggregation into educational goal subsets at the campus level results in a small number of respondents in a number of the table cells. At this level, the results are best interpreted in fairly general terms, without placing undue emphasis on exact percentages.

GOAL ACHIEVERS, STOP-OUTS, AND DROP-OUTS
AS PERCENTAGES OF ALL FOREST PARK RESPONDENTS AND
FOREST PARK RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH EDUCATIONAL GOAL CATEGORY

	GOAL ACHIEVERS	STOP-OUTS	DROP-OUTS
ALL RESPONDENTS	24%	62%	14%
AAS		82%	18%
AA	27%	55%	18%
CERTIFICATE	14%	86%	
GENERAL TRANSFER	50%	50%	
IMPROVE JOB SKILLS	41%	50%	9%
CAREER TRAINING	25%	58%	17%
PERSONAL INTEREST	11%	56%	33%

GOAL ACHIEVERS, STOP-OUTS, AND DROP-OUTS
AS PERCENTAGES OF ALL FLORISSANT VALLEY RESPONDENTS AND
FLORISSANT VALLEY RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH EDUCATIONAL GOAL CATEGORY

	GOAL ACHIEVERS	STOP-OUTS	DROP-OUTS
ALL RESPONDENTS	19%	71%	10%
AAS	3%	89%	8%
AA	4%	92%	4%
CERTIFICATE		100%	
GENERAL TRANSFER	42%	42%	16%
IMPROVE JOB SKILLS	31%	63%	6%
CAREER TRAINING	25%	50%	25%
PERSONAL INTEREST	50%	25%	25%

GOAL ACHIEVERS, STOP-OUTS, AND DROP-OUTS
AS PERCENTAGES OF ALL MERAMEC RESPONDENTS AND
MERAMEC RESPONDENTS WITHIN EACH EDUCATIONAL GOAL CATEGORY

	GOAL ACHIEVERS	STOP-OUTS	DROP-OUTS
ALL RESPONDENTS	36%	56%	8%
AAS	4%	96%	
AA	25%	70%	5%
CERTIFICATE		100%	
GENERAL TRANSFER	60%	26%	14%
IMPROVE JOB SKILLS	40%	52%	8%
CAREER TRAINING	20%	70%	10%
PERSONAL INTEREST	45%	48%	7%

CHAPTER III

REASONS FOR STOPPING-OUT AND DROPPING-OUT

Those nonreturners who had not completed their educational goal, i.e. stop-outs and drop-outs, were asked to respond to a question regarding their reasons for interrupting or discontinuing attendance at St. Louis Community College. The question listed sixteen potential reasons and space for respondents to specify additional reasons. It asked that stop-outs and drop-outs respond to each item in the list by indicating whether it was a "A Major Reason", "A Minor Reason", or "Not A Reason".

The sixteen potential reasons listed on the questionnaire are presented in the top half of the table on the following page listed in descending order with respect to the percentage of stop-outs who indicated each as "A Major Reason" for interrupting their attendance at SLCC. Each reason is followed by both the percentage citing it as "A Major Reason" and the percentage citing it as "A Minor Reason". The bottom half of the table presents the corresponding information for drop-outs.

As can be seen in the table, "Other Demands On Time..." and "Demands Of Job..." ranked 1 and 2 as both reasons for stopping-out and dropping-out. Reasons related to financial considerations and course times completed the top five reasons for stopping-out, and areas of dissatisfaction and change of residence ranked in the top five major reasons for dropping-out. In general, stop-outs were more highly concentrated in a few reason categories, while drop-outs were more evenly distributed over a wide range of reasons.

Reasons not included in the list, but specified by stop-outs under "Other" were: course not offered; course canceled; course full, re-evaluating goals; illness; pregnancy or new baby; personal problems; personal motivation; child care; and marriage. Each was specified by 2% or less of the stop-outs. "Other" reasons specified by drop-outs were: course not offered; illness; re-evaluating goals; course full; and transportation. The first two were cited by 7% and 5% of the drop-outs, respectively. Two percent cited each of the other three.

The campus counterparts to the District table are presented on the three pages immediately following the District table. The presentation format is the same for each table, except the unit of analysis is the individual campus. It should be noted that the total number of drop-out respondents is rather small at the the individual campus level of analysis.

The sum of the stop-outs and drop-outs in the campus tables is less than the District totals because some respondents did not include campus identifying information. Percentages in all tables are percentages of those stop-outs or drop-outs actually responding to the question, and are rounded to the nearest whole percent.

DISTRICT

TOTAL NUMBER OF STOP-OUTS ANSWERING QUESTION = 258

REASONS FOR STOPPING-OUT	PERCENTAGE INDICATING: MAJOR REASON	MINOR REASON
Other Demands On Time Too Great To Take Courses	46%	28%
Demands Of Job Too Great To Take Courses	31%	27%
Needed To Work More Hours To Meet Financial Commitments	24%	19%
Can Not Take Courses At The Times They Are Offered	22%	24%
Could Not Afford Fees, Books, Etc.	15%	19%
Discouraged By Slow Progress Toward Goal	9%	26%
Dissatisfied With Quality Of Instruction	6%	9%
Dissatisfied With Content Of Courses	4%	9%
Courses Were Too Difficult	3%	12%
Dissatisfied With Counseling And Advising Services	3%	9%
Was Placed On Academic Probation Or Suspension	3%	2%
Academic Difficulties Other Than Probation or Suspension	2%	5%
Changed Goal, Courses For New Goal Not Offered	2%	2%
Moved, SLCC Not Convenient From New Home	2%	2%
Changed Goal, Do Not Require Further Education	1%	3%
Courses Were Too Easy	0%	2%

TOTAL NUMBER OF DROP-OUTS ANSWERING QUESTION = 41

REASONS FOR DROPPING-OUT	PERCENTAGE INDICATING: MAJOR REASON	MINOR REASON
Other Demands On Time Too Great To Take Courses	29%	22%
Demands Of Job Too Great To Take Courses	22%	17%
Dissatisfied With Counseling And Advising Services	17%	5%
Dissatisfied With Quality Of Instruction	15%	12%
Moved, SLCC Not Convenient From New Home	15%	2%
Discouraged By Slow Progress Toward Goal	12%	17%
Needed To Work More Hours To Meet Financial Commitments	12%	7%
Can Not Take Courses At The Times They Are Offered	12%	7%
Dissatisfied With Content Of Courses	10%	12%
Could Not Afford Fees, Books, Etc.	7%	5%
Changed Goal, Courses For New Goal Not Offered	7%	2%
Changed Goal, Do Not Require Further Education	7%	-
Courses Were Too Easy	5%	2%
Was Placed On Academic Probation Or Suspension	2%	2%
Academic Difficulties Other Than Probation or Suspension	2%	-
Courses Were Too Difficult	-	-

FOREST PARK

TOTAL NUMBER OF STOP-OUTS ANSWERING QUESTIONS = 54

REASONS FOR STOPPING-OUT	PERCENTAGE INDICATING: MAJOR REASON	MINOR REASON
Other Demands On Time Too Great To Take Courses	46%	24%
Needed To Work More Hours To Meet Financial Commitments	30%	20%
Demands Of Job Too Great To Take Courses	26%	26%
Can Not Take Courses At The Times They Are Offered	26%	22%
Could Not Afford Fees, Books, Etc.	13%	17%
Discouraged By Slow Progress Toward Goal	9%	24%
Academic Difficulties Other Than Probation or Suspension	9%	4%
Was Placed On Academic Probation Or Suspension	7%	6%
Dissatisfied With Content Of Courses	6%	13%
Dissatisfied With Counseling And Advising Services	6%	6%
Dissatisfied With Quality Of Instruction	4%	11%
Courses Were Too Difficult	4%	7%
Courses Were Too Easy	2%	6%
Changed Goal, Courses For New Goal Not Offered	2%	4%
Changed Goal, Do Not Require Further Education	2%	4%
Moved, SLCC Not Convenient From New Home	-	2%

TOTAL NUMBER OF DROP-OUTS ANSWERING QUESTION = 13

REASONS FOR DROPPING-OUT	PERCENTAGE INDICATING: MAJOR REASON	MINOR REASON
Other Demands On Time Too Great To Take Courses	31%	15%
Moved, SLCC Not Convenient From New Home	23%	-
Discouraged By Slow Progress Toward Goal	15%	15%
Can Not Take Courses At The Times They Are Offered	15%	15%
Demands Of Job Too Great To Take Courses	15%	8%
Dissatisfied With Quality Of Instruction	15%	8%
Could Not Afford Fees, Books, Etc.	15%	8%
Dissatisfied With Counseling And Advising Services	15%	-
Dissatisfied With Content Of Courses	15%	-
Changed Goal, Courses For New Goal Not Offered	8%	8%
Needed To Work More Hours To Meet Financial Commitments	8%	-
Changed Goal, Do Not Require Further Education	8%	-
Was Placed On Academic Probation Or Suspension	8%	-
Courses Were Too Easy	-	-
Academic Difficulties Other Than Probation or Suspension	-	-
Courses Were Too Difficult	-	-

FLORISSANT VALLEY

TOTAL NUMBER OF STOP-OUTS ANSWERING QUESTION = 87

REASONS FOR STOPPING-OUT	PERCENTAGE INDICATING: MAJOR REASON	MINOR REASON
Other Demands On Time Too Great To Take Courses	44%	26%
Demands Of Job Too Great To Take Courses	30%	26%
Needed To Work More Hours To Meet Financial Commitments	24%	20%
Can Not Take Courses At The Times They Are Offered	18%	22%
Could Not Afford Fees, Books, Etc.	15%	20%
Discouraged By Slow Progress Toward Goal	10%	33%
Dissatisfied With Quality Of Instruction	6%	11%
Dissatisfied With Counseling And Advising Services	6%	11%
Dissatisfied With Content Of Courses	5%	11%
Courses Were Too Difficult	3%	16%
Moved, SLCC Not Convenient From New Home	3%	3%
Changed Goal, Courses For New Goal Not Offered	2%	2%
Changed Goal, Do Not Require Further Education	2%	2%
Was Placed On Academic Probation Or Suspension	2%	1%
Academic Difficulties Other Than Probation or Suspension	1%	6%
Courses Were Too Easy	-	-

TOTAL NUMBER OF DROP-OUTS ANSWERING QUESTION = 11

REASONS FOR DROPPING-OUT	PERCENTAGE INDICATING: MAJOR REASON	MINOR REASON
Dissatisfied With Counseling And Advising Services	27%	9%
Dissatisfied With Quality Of Instruction	27%	9%
Other Demands On Time Too Great To Take Courses	18%	18%
Demands Of Job Too Great To Take Courses	18%	18%
Moved, SLCC Not Convenient From New Home		18%
Dissatisfied With Content Of Courses	9%	18%
Discouraged By Slow Progress Toward Goal	9%	9%
Needed To Work More Hours To Meet Financial Commitments	9%	9%
Can Not Take Courses At The Times They Are Offered	9%	-
Changed Goal, Courses For New Goal Not Offered	9%	-
Changed Goal, Do Not Require Further Education	9%	-
Academic Difficulties Other Than Probation or Suspension	9%	-
Courses Were Too Easy	-	9%
Was Placed On Academic Probation Or Suspension	-	9%
Could Not Afford Fees, Books, Etc.	-	-
Courses Were Too Difficult	-	-

MERAMEC

TOTAL NUMBER OF STOP-OUTS ANSWERING QUESTION = 99

REASONS FOR STOPPING-OUT	PERCENTAGE INDICATING: MAJOR REASON	MINOR REASON
Other Demands On Time Too Great To Take Courses	45%	32%
Demands Of Job Too Great To Take Courses	34%	27%
Can Not Take Courses At The Times They Are Offered	24%	25%
Needed To Work More Hours To Meet Financial Commitments	20%	15%
Could Not Afford Fees, Books, Etc.	12%	18%
Discouraged By Slow Progress Toward Goal	8%	18%
Dissatisfied With Quality Of Instruction	7%	5%
Dissatisfied With Content Of Courses	3%	5%
Changed Goal, Courses For New Goal Not Offered	3%	-
Dissatisfied With Counseling And Advising Services	1%	8%
Was Placed On Academic Probation Or Suspension	1%	2%
Courses Were Too Difficult	-	12%
Academic Difficulties Other Than Probation or Suspension	-	5%
Moved, SLCC Not Convenient From New Home	-	2%
Changed Goal, Do Not Require Further Education	-	1%
Courses Were Too Easy	-	1%

TOTAL NUMBER OF DROP-OUTS ANSWERING QUESTION = 14

REASONS FOR DROPPING-OUT	PERCENTAGE INDICATING: MAJOR REASON	MINOR REASON
Other Demands On Time Too Great To Take Courses	43%	21%
Demands Of Job Too Great To Take Courses	36%	21%
Discouraged By Slow Progress Toward Goal	14%	21%
Needed To Work More Hours To Meet Financial Commitments	14%	14%
Dissatisfied With Counseling And Advising Services	14%	7%
Dissatisfied With Quality Of Instruction	7%	14%
Dissatisfied With Content Of Courses	7%	14%
Can Not Take Courses At The Times They Are Offered	7%	7%
Could Not Afford Fees, Books, Etc.	7%	7%
Courses Were Too Easy	7%	7%
Changed Goal, Courses For New Goal Not Offered	7%	-
Changed Goal, Do Not Require Further Education	7%	-
Moved, SLCC Not Convenient From New Home	-	7%
Was Placed On Academic Probation Or Suspension	-	-
Academic Difficulties Other Than Probation or Suspension	-	-
Courses Were Too Difficult	-	-

CHAPTER IV

RATINGS OF ST. LOUIS COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

RATINGS

All respondents were asked to rate St. Louis Community College "... as an educational institution for students with your educational goal" on the following scale: "Poor", "Fair", "Good" or "Excellent". The table below presents the percentages of all respondents, the percentages of all respondents within each educational goal category, and the percentages of goal achievers, stop-outs, and drop-outs awarding each rating. (All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percent, and the sum of the ratings do not add to exactly 100% in some cases due to rounding.)

RESPONDENTS' RATINGS OF ST. LOUIS COMMUNITY COLLEGE

PERCENTAGES AWARDING EACH RATING

	RATING			
	POOR	FAIR	GOOD	EXCELLENT
ALL RESPONDENTS	1%	10%	55%	33%
AAS		11%	56%	33%
AA		9%	59%	33%
CERTIFICATE	4%		61%	35%
GENERAL TRANSFER	1%	11%	48%	39%
IMPROVE JOB SKILLS	2%	12%	52%	33%
CAREER TRAINING	5%	5%	61%	29%
PERSONAL INTEREST		13%	60%	28%
GOAL ACHIEVERS	2%	10%	41%	47%
STOP-OUTS	1%	7%	64%	28%
DROP-OUTS	5%	30%	35%	30%

The finding that 88% of the respondents rate SLCC as either "Good" or "Excellent" with one-third rating it "Excellent" is fairly closely replicated within each educational goal subset. The percentages awarding either a "Good" or "Excellent" rating range from a low of 85% in the Improve Job Skills subset to a high of 96% in the Certificate subset. The percentages rating SLCC as "Excellent" vary from a low of 28% in the Personal Interest subset to a high of 39% of the General Transfer respondents.

As might be expected, when the findings are examined by type of nonreturner, the percentage rating SLCC either "Good" or "Excellent" is the lowest for drop-outs, 65% compared to 88% of goal achievers and 92% of stop-outs. Interestingly, however, almost one-third of the drop-outs rated it "Excellent", while only 5% rated it "Poor".

Campus level tables are presented on the following page.

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Respondents were also provided with space at the end of the questionnaire which they were asked to use "...to tell us what changes could be made at SLCC to better serve students with your educational goal?". Fifty-seven percent of the respondents District-wide (62% of the Forest Park respondents, 65% of the Florissant Valley respondents, and 50% of the Meramec respondents) made no comments or suggestions. The comments of the other 43% are summarized below.

Seven percent of the respondents (6% of the Forest Park respondents, 6% of the Florissant Valley respondents, and 7% of the Meramec respondents) used the space to comment negatively on the quality of instruction. It should be noted, however, that most of the comments were aimed at individual faculty members, and in a number of cases were accompanied by positive comments about other faculty members or the faculty in general.

Six percent of the respondents (3% of Forest Park respondents, 6% of the Florissant Valley respondents, and 7% of the Meramec respondents) wanted more weekend and/or evening courses.

Other areas included in the comments, each of which was cited by 3% or less of the respondents were as follows: counseling/advising; courses and programs; scheduling alternatives; financial aid; more telecourses; a need for child care services (at Meramec); registration/withdrawal procedures and policies; facilities and equipment; lower bookstore prices; more off-campus courses; job placement and internships; class cancellations; and academic help.

Nineteen percent (18% of the Forest Park respondents, 13% of the Florissant Valley respondents, and 22% of the Meramec respondents) used the space to make positive comments about St. Louis Community College and the quality of education they received here.

FOREST PARK RESPONDENTS'
RATINGS OF ST. LOUIS COMMUNITY COLLEGE

PERCENTAGES AWARDING EACH RATING

	RATING			
	POOR	FAIR	GOOD	EXCELLENT
ALL RESPONDENTS	1%	12%	57%	30%
AAS		18%	64%	18%
AA		9%	45%	45%
CERTIFICATE			57%	43%
GENERAL TRANSFER			58%	42%
IMPROVE JOB SKILLS		9%	64%	27%
CAREER TRAINING	9%	9%	45%	36%
PERSONAL INTEREST		33%	56%	11%
GOAL ACHIEVERS		9%	52%	39%
STOP-OUTS	2%	9%	60%	29%
DROP-OUTS		31%	54%	15%

FLORISSANT VALLEY RESPONDENTS'
RATINGS OF ST. LOUIS COMMUNITY COLLEGE

PERCENTAGES AWARDING EACH RATING

	RATING			
	POOR	FAIR	GOOD	EXCELLENT
ALL RESPONDENTS	2%	7%	56%	35%
AAS		8%	51%	41%
AA		8%	63%	29%
CERTIFICATE			63%	38%
GENERAL TRANSFER		10%	57%	33%
IMPROVE JOB SKILLS	6%	6%	50%	38%
CAREER TRAINING	13%		88%	
PERSONAL INTEREST				100%
GOAL ACHIEVERS	9%	4%	39%	48%
STOP-OUTS		4%	66%	29%
DROP-OUTS		23%	23%	54%

MERAMEC RESPONDENTS'
RATINGS OF ST. LOUIS COMMUNITY COLLEGE

PERCENTAGES AWARDING EACH RATING

	RATING			
	POOR	FAIR	GOOD	EXCELLENT
ALL RESPONDENTS	1%	12%	52%	36%
AAS		13%	54%	33%
AA		5%	55%	40%
CERTIFICATE			75%	25%
GENERAL TRANSFER	2%	17%	43%	38%
IMPROVE JOB SKILLS		17%	43%	39%
CAREER TRAINING		5%	58%	37%
PERSONAL INTEREST		7%	68%	25%
GOAL ACHIEVERS		11%	38%	52%
STOP-OUTS		9%	63%	29%
DROP-OUTS	7%	43%	36%	14%

APPENDIX I: STUDENT OUTCOMES AND RETENTION

The measurement and assessment of student outcomes and institutional effectiveness as it relates to those outcomes takes many forms. At a very basic level, outcomes are often implicitly, if not explicitly, evaluated in terms of program completion as evidenced by graduation. This form of outcomes evaluation combines outcomes and retention questions, and it is in a similar, but modified, vein that these questions are examined here.

The unmodified version of this approach typically gives rise to three classifications of former students: "Completers", defined as graduates; "Persisters", defined as those who are currently enrolled; and "Drop-Outs", defined as those who have not graduated and are not currently enrolled. The modified version employed here redefines these categories in a manner more appropriate in the community college context.

The modified definitions for each category of former student are given below, expressed in terms of additions to or subtractions from their unmodified counterparts. Each definition is followed by a brief explanation of the rationale for the modification.

(1) Completers = graduates + non-degree goal achievers

Since the community college mission includes providing educational services and opportunities to persons with educational goals which do not involve a degree, the concept of Completers must clearly be expanded to include non-degree goal achievers.

(2) Persisters = those currently enrolled + stop-outs

The community college also serves students whose other commitments (work, family, etc.) make it necessary or desirable to pursue their education through intermittent attendance. Despite the apparent contradiction in terms, the ability to "stop"-out allows them to "persist" in the pursuit of educational goals which might otherwise have to be abandoned for the sake of the other commitments. It would be inappropriate and inconsistent to regard these people as Persisters only during the semesters that they are actually enrolled.

(3) Drop-Outs = those who have not graduated and are not currently enrolled - (non-degree goal achievers and stop-outs)

The rationales given above for adding non-degree goal achievers to the Completers definition, and stop-outs to the Persisters definition are, of course, also the basis for subtracting them from the Drop-Out definition. The

subtraction appropriately limits the Drop-Out designation to those former students who have not achieved their educational goals (degree or non-degree), and do not plan to return.

The components of these definitions which correspond to their unmodified counterparts can be determined from institutional data files. At St. Louis Community College, they are determined for each semester as of census date of the following semester, and published in a report entitled, Continuation, Graduation, And Nonreturn Rates. Survey findings such as those reported in Chapter II of this report can be combined with the institutional data to estimate the goal achiever, stop-out, and drop-out components, and thus provide fully quantified estimates of the modified definitions. The table on the following page provides such estimates for the Fall 1987 SLCC student body and educational goal subsets included in the survey.

The first section of the table lists the percentages of the Fall student body: graduating; not graduating, but re-enrolling for the Spring semester; and not graduating and not returning for the Spring semester as determined from institutional data, and and distributes those percentages to the "Completer", "Persister", and "Drop-out" categories. The distribution of graduates and re-enrolled students is straightforward. All graduates are "Completers". All re-enrolled students are "Persisters". The nonreturners, however, are a composite of "Completers", i.e., non-degree goal achievers; "Persisters", i.e., stop-outs; and "Drop-outs". That distribution was made on the basis of survey findings as described below.

From the institutional data, we know that nonreturners were 40% of the student body. From the nonreturning student survey we know that 27% of the respondents were non-degree goal achievers, 63% were stop-outs, and 10% were drop-outs. Assuming these respondent percentages are reasonably accurate estimates of the corresponding percentages within the nonreturning student population from which the sample was drawn, the goal achiever component can be estimated as 27% of 40% = 11% of the student body, the stop-out component as 63% of 40% = 25% of the student body, and the drop-out component as 10% of 40% = 4% of the student body.

The subsequent sections of the table perform the same type of analysis for the individual educational goal subsets. In each case, the distribution of nonreturners to the "Completers", "Persisters", and "Drop-outs" column is performed as illustrated above, using the appropriate percentages for the particular goal as reported in the first table in Chapter II of this report.

All percentages are rounded to the nearest whole percent. Parts do not sum exactly to totals in some cases due to this rounding.

ST. LOUIS COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

		COMPLETERS	PERSISTERS	DROP-OUTS
FALL 1987 STUDENT BODY:				
Graduating At End Of Fall Semester	2%	2%		
Not Graduating, Enrolled In Spring	58%		58%	
Not Graduating, Not Enrolled In Spring	40%	11%	25%	4%
		13%	83%	4%
FALL 1987 AAS STUDENTS:				
Graduating At End Of Fall Semester	4%	4%		
Not Graduating, Enrolled In Spring	67%		67%	
Not Graduating, Not Enrolled In Spring	29%	1%	26%	3%
		5%	93%	3%
FALL 1987 AA STUDENTS:				
Graduating At End Of Fall Semester	3%	3%		
Not Graduating, Enrolled In Spring	65%		65%	
Not Graduating, Not Enrolled In Spring	32%	5%	24%	2%
		8%	89%	2%
FALL 1987 CERTIFICATE STUDENTS:				
Graduating At End Of Fall Semester	3%	3%		
Not Graduating, Enrolled In Spring	53%		53%	
Not Graduating, Not Enrolled In Spring	44%	2%	42%	<1%
		5%	95%	<1%
FALL 1987 GENERAL TRANSFER STUDENT:				
Graduating At End Of Fall Semester	1%	1%		
Not Graduating, Enrolled In Spring	60%		60%	
Not Graduating, Not Enrolled In Spring	39%	19%	15%	5%
		20%	75%	5%
FALL 1987 IMPROVE JOB SKILLS STUDENTS:				
Graduating At End Of Fall Semester	0%	0%		
Not Graduating, Enrolled In Spring	38%		38%	
Not Graduating, Not Enrolled In Spring	62%	23%	33%	6%
		23%	71%	6%
FALL 1987 CAREER TRAINING STUDENTS:				
Graduating At End Of Fall Semester	1%	1%		
Not Graduating, Enrolled In Spring	52%		52%	
Not Graduating, Not Enrolled In Spring	47%	11%	30%	7%
		12%	82%	7%
FALL 1987 PERSONAL INTEREST STUDENTS:				
Graduating At End Of Fall Semester	0%	0%		
Not Graduating, Enrolled In Spring	45%		45%	
Not Graduating, Not Enrolled In Spring	55%	21%	26%	8%
		21%	71%	8%

St. Louis Community College

This survey is part of St. Louis Community College's effort to continually assess how well it is serving a diverse student body with a variety of educational goals. As a former (and perhaps future) SLCC student your response can be extremely helpful. Thank you for your assistance.

1. Please check the educational goal you hope(d) to accomplish by attending St. Louis Community College. (Check only one.)

   Associate of Applied Science degree _____
   Associate of Arts Degree _____
   Certificate _____
   College/University Transfer Credit (No Degree or Certificate) _____
   Improvement of Existing Job Skills (No Degree or Certificate) _____
   Preparation for a Job to be Obtained (No Degree or Certificate) _____
   Increased Knowledge in an Area of Personal Interest (No Degree or Certificate) _____

2. Did you complete this goal by the end of the Fall 1987 semester? No _____ Yes _____

   If no, did you make satisfactory progress toward this goal? No _____ Yes _____

3. What semester and year did you begin pursuing this goal at SLCC? Semester _____ Year _____

4. How many Fall, Spring, and Summer semesters have you attended in pursuit of this goal?

   Number of Fall Semesters _____
   Number of Spring Semesters _____
   Number of Summer Sessions _____

5. Approximately how many courses have you taken in pursuit of this goal? _____

6. Check the statement which most accurately describes your plans for future attendance at SLCC.

   Do Not Plan to Re-Enroll _____
   Plan to Re-Enroll to Complete Goal _____
   Plan to Re-Enroll to Pursue a Different Goal _____

7. Please check the semesters in which you plan to attend SLCC within the next year. (Check all that apply.)

   Summer 1988 _____ Fall 1988 _____ Spring 1989 _____ None _____

8. How would you rate St. Louis Community College as an educational institution for students with your educational goal?

Poor _____ Fair _____ Good _____ Excellent _____

IF YOU DID NOT COMPLETE YOUR EDUCATIONAL GOAL BY THE END OF THE FALL 1987 SEMESTER, ANSWER QUESTION 9. IF YOU DID COMPLETE YOUR GOAL, SKIP TO QUESTION 10.

9. Please indicate to what extent each of the following was a reason for interrupting or discontinuing attendance at St. Louis Community College by writing 0, 1, or 2 in the blank following each item.

0 = Not a Reason 1 = A Minor Reason 2 = A Major Reason

Changed goal, courses for new goal not offered at SLCC _____
Changed goal, new goal does not require further education _____
Discouraged by slow progress toward goal _____
Demands of my job too great to continue taking courses _____
Other demands on my time too great to continue taking courses _____
Can not take courses at the times they are offered _____
Dissatisfied with the content of courses I have taken _____
Courses were too difficult _____
Courses were too easy _____
Dissatisfied with the quality of instruction _____
Dissatisfied with counseling and advising services _____
Was placed on academic probation or suspension _____
Academic difficulties other than probation or suspension _____
Could not afford fees, books, etc. _____
Needed to work more hours to meet other financial commitments _____
Moved, SLCC not convenient from new home _____
Other (specify) _____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____

10. Are you attending another educational institution? No _____ Yes _____

If yes, please name the institution _____
_____

11. What St. Louis Community College location did you attend in the Fall 1987 semester? (Check all that apply.)

Forest Park	_____	South County Education Center	_____
Florissant Valley	_____	West County Education Center	_____
Meramec	_____	Other Off-Campus Location	_____

12. How many credit hours did you take in the Fall 1987 semester? _____

13. What was your Fall 1987 entry status?

First time at SLCC and no credits transferred in _____

First time at SLCC, but transferred credits from another college _____

Had attended SLCC before, but not in the Spring or Summer of 1987 _____

Had attended Spring or Summer of 1987 _____

14. Please provide the following demographic information about yourself so that we can determine how closely respondent characteristics match those of the general student population.

SEX Female _____ Male _____

AGE

Under 21 _____	26-30 _____	36-40 _____	51-60 _____
21-25 _____	31-35 _____	41-50 _____	Over 60 _____

ETHNIC ORIGIN Black _____ White _____ Other _____

RESIDENCY City of St. Louis _____ Other, MO _____
St. Louis County _____ Out of State _____

HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION PRIOR TO FALL 1987 SEMESTER

High School _____	Certificate _____	Bachelors Degree _____
Some College _____	Associates Degree _____	Masters or Above _____

EMPLOYMENT STATUS

Employed:	Full-time _____	Unemployed:	Seeking Work _____
	Part-time _____		Not Seeking Work _____

332 100364 6/88

15. We value your comments and opinions. Please use the space below to tell us what changes could be made at SLCC to better serve students with your educational goal?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP

Fall classes begin on August 22, 1988. For course information, please call:

FOREST PARK 644-9127 FLORISSANT VALLEY 595-4244 MERAMEC 966-7601

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges APR 14 1989